1

2

4

5

7 8

9

1011

1213

14

1516

17

18

1920

21

22

2324

///

25

27

26

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ASA JAVON BROWN,

CALVIN JOHNSON, et al.,

Case No. 2:21-cv-01396-GMN-VCF

Petitioner,

V.

Respondents.

ORDER

This habeas matter is before the Court on Respondents' second unopposed Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 54). Respondents seek an extension of time to file their Reply in support of their Motion to Dismiss. The Court finds that the request is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and therefore, good cause exists to grant Respondents' motion.

Habeas actions are civil actions under federal practice and are subject to the reporting requirements of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 ("CJRA"), 28 U.S.C. § 471, et seq. ¹ Given the Court's case management responsibilities under the CJRA and the age of this case, moving forward counsel will be required to prioritize the briefing of the motion to dismiss in this case over later-filed matters.

It is therefore ordered that Respondents' second unopposed Motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 54) is granted. Respondents have until **January 19, 2024**, to file their reply in support of their motion to dismiss.

///

¹ The CJRA provides that each United States District Court must develop a civil justice expense and delay reduction plan to facilitate the deliberate adjudication of civil cases on the merits, monitor and improve litigation management, and reduce cost and delay. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 (noting the rules should be implemented to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination" of each case). The CJRA mandates the early and on-going judicial management of case progress. 28 U.S.C. § 473(a).

Case 2:21-cv-01396-GMN-MDC Document 56 Filed 01/10/24 Page 2 of 2

It is further ordered that counsel must prioritize the briefing of the motion to dismiss in this case over later-filed matters. Further extensions of time are not likely to be granted absent compelling circumstances and a strong showing of good cause why the briefing could not be completed within the extended time allowed despite the exercise of due diligence.

DATED: January 10, 2024

GLØRIA M. NAVARRO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE